

REMARKS

Claims 1-24 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1 and 13 have been amended. No claims have been added or canceled. Therefore, claims 1-24 will remain pending in the application after entry of the foregoing claim amendments.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the time and attention afforded by Examiner Nalven during a telephonic interview on January 17, 2008. During the interview, Applicants' representative and Examiner Nalven discussed claims 1 and 13, the cited references, and the non-anticipatory and non-obvious nature of the claims in view of the references. Applicants' representative proposed amending the claims to further distinguish the claimed embodiments from the cited references. Examiner Nalven agreed to reconsider the application in view of the proposed amendments. Accordingly, Applicants have amended the claims as discussed during the interview.

Independent claims 1 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0077985 ("Kobata") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,714,921 ("Stefik") and in further view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0217034 ("Shutt"). Without conceding the merits of the rejection, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 13 to further clarify the claimed embodiments.

As amended, claims 1 and 13 each recite, in part, receiving a request for a copy of a document in a folder and then delivering the copy of the document to the requestor with rights data. The rights data is *dynamically defined* using the rights information of the folder. Moreover, the rights data *accompanies the copy of the document* as part of a package.

While Kobata appears to disclose a digital rights file attached to digital content (*see* Kobata at FIG. 18), as acknowledged in the Office Action, Kobata does not disclose defining rights in the attached digital rights file using the rights information of a folder (*see* Office Action dated November 5, 2007 ("Office Action") at p. 3). Furthermore, combining the teachings of Stefik and Shutt with the teachings of Kobata does not produce the claimed embodiments because neither Stefik nor Shutt teach or suggest using rights information of a folder to define rights data for a copy of a document such that the rights data accompanies the copy of the document as part of a package.

More specifically, Stefik notes that usage and file management rights may be attached to a folder containing a document (Stefik at col. 11, lines 2-8), but Stefik does not disclose that the usage and management rights accompany the document as part of a package. Rather, Stefik teaches that the document in the folder is subject to its own rights, which may be attached via an “authoring tool or digital work assembling tool” (*id.* at col. 11, lines 5-6 and 22-30). In other words, while the usage and file management rights attached to the folder may be used to control access to the document, the rights attached to the folder are not used to define the rights that accompany the document itself because these rights are defined independently, *i.e.*, via Stefik’s authoring tool.

Similarly, Shutt notes that a “user’s access rights to [a] document are defined ***by both the folder security profile and the document security profile***” (Shutt at ¶ [0100]) (emphasis added). Thus, like Stefik, the rights in Shutt’s document security profile are independent of (*i.e.*, not defined by) the rights in Shutt’s folder security profile. Moreover, the rights associated with Shutt’s document security profile do not accompany a copy of the document because Shutt does not maintain or permit access to any copies of the document (*see id.* at ¶ [0092] (“A document cannot be removed from the repository by any party.”)).

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 13 patentably define over the combination of Kobata, Stefik and Shutt because none of the references teaches or suggests defining rights data for a copy of a document using rights information of a folder such that the rights data accompanies the copy of the document as part of a package. Applicants respectfully request, therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claims 2, 6-12, 14 and 18-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobata in view of Stefik and in further view of Shutt. Claims 3-5 and 15-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobata, Stefik and Shutt in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,571,337 (“Xiao”). As claims 2-12 depend from claim 1, and claims 14-24 depend from claim 13, Applicants further submit that the dependent claims likewise patentably define over the cited references. Applicants respectfully request, therefore, withdrawal of the rejections of the dependent claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-2185/302760.2
Application No.: 10/632,356
Office Action Dated: November 5, 2007

PATENT

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are allowable and that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application and an early Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested. In the event the Examiner cannot allow the present application for any reason, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney, Bryan T. Giles at (215) 564-8954, to discuss the resolution of any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 1, 2008

/Bryan T. Giles/
Bryan T. Giles
Registration No. 60,078

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439